

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. Claims 11, 19 and 25 are amended by the present response without introducing new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 11, 12, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Yoshida et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,815,289, herein "Yoshida"); and Claims 1-10, 13-24, 27 and 28 are allowed.

Initially, applicants gratefully acknowledge the early indication of the allowable subject matter in Claims 1-10, 13-24, 27 and 28.

Further, Applicants and Applicants' representatives thank Examiner Worku for the courtesy of the interview conducted on November 30, 2005. During the interview, differences between the inventions of the rejected independent claims and the applied reference were discussed. Further, claim amendments to clarify the claimed features were also discussed. The present response sets forth the discussed claim amendments and the following remarks set forth the discussed differences.

Addressing now the rejection of Claims 11, 12, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Yoshida, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

In a non-limiting example, Fig. 2 shows a single communication line 210 that directly connects to an obverse image processing unit 201b-204b and to a reverse image processing unit 201a-204a.

As discussed in the interview, Claim 11 and similarly Claim 25 are amended to more clearly distinguish over Yoshida. Claim 11 now recites, in part,

a **single** communication line which **directly** connects to said obverse image processing unit and to said reverse image processing unit, the communication line being used in transmitting or receiving the image data with the appended identifying information.

Yoshida describes a facsimile apparatus. Further, Yoshida describes a signal line between the control circuit and the display circuit.¹ However, as agreed on in the interview, Yoshida does not describe or suggest a single communication line that directly connects to said obverse image processing unit and to said reverse image processing unit, the communication line being used in transmitting or receiving the image data with the appended identifying information, as recited in Claim 11. In Yoshida the signal line 250g, the only signal line noted in the cited portion of Yoshida, does not include such a structure.

Additionally, in Fig 15b of Yoshida the “Front Side Reading Circuit 110” is connected to 110a, and the “Back Side Reading Circuit 112” is connected to 112a. In contrast, Claims 11 and 25 describe “a single communications line which directly connects to said obverse image processing unit and to said reverse image processing unit,” resulting in the advantage of small circuit configuration while Yoshida results in a more complicated circuit configuration.

Therefore, Yoshida does not describe a single communication line that directly connects to the obverse and reverse processing units as is recited in Claim 11 and similarly in Claim 25.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 11 and 25 and claims depending therefrom, patentably distinguish over Yoshida.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-28 is earnestly solicited.

¹Yoshida, Col. 27, lines 21-26, lines 56-63, Fig. 21b.

Application No. 09/770,214
Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\JL\202321us\202321us_AM(FP 2.8.06).doc

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423